



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,273	12/04/2003	Harish Scripad Kulkarni	MS1-1706US	7122
22801 7590 12/12/2008				
LEE & HAYES, PLLC				
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE				
SUITE 1400				
SPOKANE, WA 99201				
EXAMINER				
ABDIN, SHAHEDA A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/12/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

<b>Application No.</b> 10/728,273	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KULKARNI ET AL.
<b>Examiner</b> SHAHEDA A. ABDIN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2629

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 17 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: none.  
Claim(s) objected to: none.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 18-20.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☒ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Richard Hjerpe/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

Shaheda A Abdin  
Examiner  
Art Unit: 2629

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See

As to claim 1:

Applicant argues that "Firester and Li combination does not suggest reformatting the video data on an intermediate computer for display on a number of the small displays that are part of the large display as recited in the above-reproduced claim 1".

In response, Examiner disagree applicant's point of view. Note that Firester clearly teaches reformatting the video data (i.e. reformatting or adjusting the relative brightness of the image) on an intermediate computer (i.e. 106) for display on a number of the small displays (i.e. multiple monitor or tiles display 110, 130, 102, 140) that are part of the large display (i.e. display 100); (column 5, lines ). Thus, the reference of Firester teaches the claim limitations as recited in claim 1.

As to claim 6:

Applicant argues that "Firester and Li combination does not suggest a computer to receive configuration information respectively from a plurality of clients, each of thereof configuration information including attribute information associated with a separate small display that is part of a large display," as is recited in claim 6, and (2) The combination of Firester and Li does not teach or suggest sending reconfigured video data from the intermediate computer to the small displays, as recited in claim 6".

In response 1 and 2, Examiner disagree Applicant's point of view. Note that Firester's reference clearly teaches this limitation. More specifically, in column 5, lines 16-25, Firester's reference clearly teaches this limitation in such that a computer (i.e. 106) to receive configuration information (e.g. bitmap or display brightness characteristic) respectively from a plurality of clients (IP1- IP4), each of the received configuration information including attribute information (brightness information) associated with a separate small display (i.e. 110) that is part of a large display (column 4, 9-42) (column 5, lines 5-25). Note that image processor IP1-IP4 configured to process the image data to the screen 102, sensor 108 senses the entire image area of screen 102 for appropriate correction functions for uniformity of brightness or other display characteristic. The image server 106 receive the uniformity of brightness or other display characteristic data from the sensor 108 and transferred the reconfiguring (adjusted or corrected) data to the display screen. Thus, the reference of Firester meets the limitation as discussed above in claim 6.

As to claim 18:

Applicant argues that "Firester, Li and Ellis combination does not suggest a module to receive configuration data from a plurality client computers each having an associated display device, the configuration data received from each client computer including a physical location and a display resolution of the display device associated therewith, as is recited in claim 18".

In response, Examiner disagree Applicant's point of view. Note that Li teaches a configuration module (in Fig. 1) configured to receive over a computer network (i.e. system area network), video data (source image or MPEG or video stream) formatted for a large display (i.e. scalable large display wall) (page 31, col 1, paragraph 5 and column 2, paragraph 1-4). Ellis teaches physical location (i.e. position active area) for each of the small displays (i.e. four separate display area) (column 4, lines 30-45, column 12, lines 30-48), and Firester teaches receive (receive at 106) configuration data (display brightness information) from a plurality client computers (IP1-IP4) each having an associated display device (e.g. IP2 is associated with tiles a10) (column 4, 9-42) (column 5, lines 5-25), (also see the discussion in claim 6). Thus, the references meet the claim limitations as recited in claim 18.

As to claim 12:

However, the Firester, Ellis, Cok and Sakai combination does not suggest a computer to "receive identification information, location information, and resolution information about each of the small displays, and to calculate the resolution of the large display based on the information," as is recited in claim 12, and (2) "Firester, Ellis, Cok and Sakai combination does not suggest a computer to video data appropriate for display on the large display into small display video data appropriate for display on the small displays depending on how the small displays are assembled," as recited in the above-reproduced claim 12".

In response 1, Examiner disagree Applicant's point of view. Note that the limitations are clearly taught by the combined references (i.e. reference of Firester, Ellis, Cok and Sakai). Firester teaches the gateway computer (i.e. server 106) including a configuration module to receive , resolution information about each of the small displays (IP1-IP4), and Ellis teaches identification information, location information (see the discussion in claim 3) and sakai (2) calculate the resolution of the large display based on information (see the discussion in the rejection of claim 12). Thus the references meet the claim limitations.

In response 2, Examiner disagree Applicant's point of view. Examiner disagree Applicant's point of view. Note that Firester explicitly teaches a computer (i.e. 106) to reformat large display (102) video data appropriate for display on the large display into small display (e.g. 110, 102) video data appropriate for display on the small displays depending on how the small displays are assembled," (see column 1, lines 25-53, and column 5, lines 5-30) (also see the discussion in the argument section of claims 1 and 6).